REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action having a mailing date of March 28, 2005. Claims 1-11 and 13-15 are pending in the present Application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 14. Consequently, claims 1-11 and 13-15 remain pending in the present Application.

This application is under Final Rejection. Applicant has presented arguments hereinbelow that Applicant believes should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the Amendment to clarify issues upon appeal.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, and 14 to recite that the bottleneck being forecast is a latent bottleneck. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification, Figure 3, step 204 and the accompanying discussion. A latent bottleneck occurs when a monitor will become bottlenecked when another bottleneck is cleared. Applicant has also amended claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, and 13 to remove the numeric designation of the steps. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added and no new search is required.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,339,750 (Hoyer) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,405,327 (Sipple). In so doing, the Examiner relied upon Hoyer as teaching obtaining performance data, analyzing performance data, and graphically displaying performance data. The Examiner cited Sipple as teaching forecasting bottlenecks.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 1 recites a method for providing performance analysis on a computer system including at least one resource group and at least one node. As the Examiner has acknowledged, claim 1 recites specific steps including

obtaining performance data for a plurality of monitors for the at least one resource group and analyzing the performance data to determine whether performance of the system can be improved using the at least one resource group. The method recited in claim 1 also includes forecasting a bottleneck, including a latent bottleneck, for a monitor and graphically displaying performance data for at least one monitor for the at least one resource group. Claims 13 and 14 recite analogous computer-readable medium and system claims.

Thus, the method, computer-readable medium, and system recited in independent claims 13 and 14 are used in analyzing the performance of resource groups. In order to analyze whether performance can be improved, the method, system, and computer-readable medium recited in claims 1, 13, and 14 are capable of forecasting latent bottlenecks. As mentioned above, latent bottlenecks are bottlenecks which do not actually exist, but which may come into being when a current bottleneck is cleared. Consequently, the method, computer-readable medium, and system recited in claims 1, 13, and 14 can better manage traffic through the computer system.

As the Examiner has acknowledged, Hoyer fails to mention forecasting bottlenecks. Consequently, the Examiner relies upon Sipple for teaching forecasting of bottlenecks. Sipple does describe an early warning system for bottlenecks, and providing warnings for actual bottlenecks. However, Applicant has found no mention in Sipple of *latent* bottlenecks which will occur once an existing bottleneck is cleared. Consequently, any combination of Hoyer and Sipple fails to teach or suggest forecasting of bottlenecks in which the bottleneck may include a latent bottleneck. Hoyer in view of Sipple, therefore, fails to teach or suggest the method, computer-readable medium, and system recited in independent claims 1, 13, and 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 13, and 14 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-11 and 15 depend upon claims 1 and 14, respectively. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 2-11 and 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-11 and 15 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

___June 8, 2005___
Date

/Janyce R. Mitchell/ Reg. No. 40,095
Janyce R. Mitchell
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(650) 493-4540